

Appl. No. 09/213,510
Amdt. dated August 12, 2003
Reply to Office Action of March 12, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS/INTERVIEW SUMMARY

In this application, an amendment was filed in response to the Final Rejection dated March 12, 2003. Subsequently, an interview by telephone was conducted with the Examiner on July 31, 2003. At the interview, the Examiner stated that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 had been overcome by the After-Final response. Accordingly, it is requested that the After-Final response be entered prior to the entry of the present amendment.

At the interview, the Examiner stated that, in spite of the argument presented in the After-Final response, he still believes that it is obvious to modify the display of Pasco (US 4,323, 951) by replacing the translucent characters 16 with the LCD of Ogura (US 5,915,822).

It was pointed out to the Examiner that in Ogura, Fig. 3, the LCD is located behind the plane of the dial plate 18, this being contrary to the claimed subject matter wherein the front surface of the liquid crystal screen is in the same plane as the front surface of the optical waveguide (claim 1), and contrary to the claimed subject matter wherein the front surface of the display is in the same plane as the front surface of the dial assembly (claim 16). It was pointed out that, in Ogura Fig. 3 and Fig. 7, the region at elements 26 and 28 forms a recess in the front surface, which recess is necessary to conduct the light from the single source 12 to the location behind the LCD, thereby to illuminate the LCD from behind. This construction in Ogura is contrary to the claimed subject matter which calls for a

continuous surface in the region of the dial and the region of the LCD (claims 1 and 16). However, the Examiner maintained his position of obviousness.

It was stated further to the Examiner that Pasco uses serrations in the surface of his optical waveguide to direct light towards the characters 16, and that such lighting may be insufficient to provide for good illumination of an LCD, particularly in view of the teaching of Ogura that the light must be directed away from the front of the display to behind the LCD for proper lighting of the LCD. Furthermore, this position of Ogura was consistent with the teaching of the present invention wherein, on page 5 of the present specification, at lines 28-30, it is stated that light sources 12 and 13 are arranged respectively behind the display 2 and the dial plate 14 for proper illumination (shown also in Fig. 2).

With respect to the last argument, the Examiner stated that since the light sources were not mentioned in the claims, he did not have to consider this aspect in the construction of the invention. However, if we would introduce the light sources into the claims by further amendment, such amendment would overcome the present rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103. In view of the final rejection, and in view of the need to do further searching with respect to the introduction of the light sources in the claims, the Examiner would consider such amendment only if an RCE were filed. Accordingly, the present RCE and response is filed.

It is noted that, while the two sources of light are not set forth in the independent claims, they do appear in claim 9. Accordingly, by the present amendment, this subject matter is added into the independent claims, and claim 9 is canceled in


view of the inclusion of its subject matter in the independent claims.

In the event there are further issues remaining the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone attorney to reach agreement to expedite issuance of this application.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Since the present claims set forth the present invention patentably and distinctly, and are not taught by the cited art either taken alone or in combination, this amendment is believed to place this case in condition for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the matter, enter this amendment, and to allow all of the claims in this case.


Respectfully submitted,
Peter Brandt, et al

by: 
MARTIN A. FARBER
Attorney for Applicants
Registered Representative
Registration No. 22,345

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR SECTION 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that the accompanying Supplemental Amendment For RCE and Interview Summary is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patent, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 12, 2003.

Dated: August 12, 2003


Martin A. Farber

866 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
(212) 758-2878